

THOMAS P. STEINDLER (*Pro Hac Vice*)  
tsteindler@mwe.com  
McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
500 N. Capitol St., N.W.  
Washington, DC 20001  
Tel: (202) 756-8000  
Fax: (202) 756-8087

Redacted - Public Version

*Attorney for Defendant  
Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation*

*Additional Counsel Listed on Signature Page*

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
OAKLAND DIVISION

PLEXXIKON INC.,

CASE NO. 4:17-cv-04405-HSG (EDL)

Plaintiff,

1

NOVARTIS PHARMACEUTICALS  
CORPORATION,

**NOVARTIS' MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 5  
RE: EVIDENCE OR ARGUMENT  
SUGGESTING DAMAGES SHOULD BE  
AWARDED FOR ANY PERIOD AFTER  
DECEMBER 2018**

Defendant.

Date: September 17, 2019

Time: 3:00 p.m.

Ctrm: 2 – 4th Floor

Judge: Honorable Haywood S. Gilliam, Jr.

REDACTED VERSION OF DOCUMENT TO BE SEALED

NOVARTIS'S MOTION *IN LIMINE* NO. 5 RE: EVIDENCE OR ARGUMENT SUGGESTING  
DAMAGES SHOULD BE AWARDED FOR ANY PERIOD AFTER DECEMBER 2018  
CASE NO. 4:17-CV-04405-HSG

## NOTICE OF MOTION

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that, pursuant to the Court’s June 20, 2018 scheduling order (ECF No. 80) on September 17, 2019 at 3:00 p.m. in Courtroom 2 (4th floor) of the above-entitled Court, located at 1301 Clay Street, Oakland, California 94612, Defendant Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation (“Novartis”) hereby does move *in limine* to preclude Plaintiff Plexxikon Inc. (“Plaintiff” or “Plexxikon”) from presenting any testimony, evidence, or argument suggesting that the jury should award damages for any period after December 2018.

## RELIEF SOUGHT

For the reasons set forth in Novartis' Motion *in Limine* No. 5, Novartis moves for an order *in limine* to preclude Plexxikon from presenting any testimony, evidence, or argument suggesting that the jury should award damages for any period after December 2018.

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP

NOVARTIS'S MOTION *IN LIMINE* No. 5 RE: EVIDENCE OR ARGUMENT SUGGESTING  
DAMAGES SHOULD BE AWARDED FOR ANY PERIOD AFTER DECEMBER 2018  
CASE NO. 4:17-CV-04405-HSG

**NOVARTIS'S MOTION IN LIMINE NO. 5  
RE: EVIDENCE OR ARGUMENT SUGGESTING DAMAGES SHOULD BE  
AWARDED FOR ANY PERIOD AFTER DECEMBER 2018**

Rule 26 requires that an expert witness must provide a report containing, among other things, a “complete statement of all opinions the witness will express and the basis and reasons for them.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(2)(B)(i). This Court’s Patent Local Rules, meanwhile, require parties asserting infringement to provide a fulsome statement of their damages contentions. P.L.R. 3-8. A plaintiff must supplement those contentions during discovery to disclose its specific theories of recovery. Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(e).

Here, Plexxikon should not be permitted to offer evidence or argument suggesting that the jury should award damages for any period before October 18, 2016, or after December 2018. Specifically, Plexxikon’s damages expert, Gregory K. Leonard, Ph.D., opines in his expert report

And at deposition Dr. Leonard conceded that

Steindler Decl. Ex. K, Leonard Dep. Tr. at 93:10-94:5.

1        This Court routinely limits experts to the opinions expressed in their expert reports. *See*,  
 2 *e.g.*, *U.S. Fidelity & Guaranty Co.*, 641 F.3d 1126, 1138 (9th Cir. 2011) (“A district court does  
 3 not abuse its discretion in limiting expert testimony to the expert’s area of expertise and the  
 4 subjects contained in the expert’s disclosure.”); *Tan v. City & County of San Francisco*, No. C  
 5 08-01564 MEJ, 2010 WL 726985, at \*4 (N.D. Cal. Feb. 26, 2010) (granting “Motion to exclude  
 6 opinions by defense experts not contained in their reports”); *Sullins v. Exxon/Mobil Corp.*, No. C  
 7 08-04927 CW, 2010 WL 11420214, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Jul. 2, 2010) (granting motion *in limine*  
 8 seeking to limit expert’s “testimony to the scope of his expert report” and stating expert’s  
 9 “testimony as an expert witness is limited to the opinions expressed in his expert report”);  
 10 *Therasense, Inc. v. Becton, Dickinson & Co.*, No. 04-cv-2123-WHA, 2008 WL 2037732, at \*4  
 11 (N.D. Cal. May 12, 2008) (experts’ testimony on direct examination to be limited “to the four  
 12 corners of their report”).

13        Moreover, “a party’s damages contentions must disclose the basis for its expert’s specific  
 14 theory of recovery.” *Looksmart Grp., Inc. v. Microsoft Corp.*, 386 F. Supp. 3d 1222, 1233 (N.D.  
 15 Cal. 2019) (citing *Golden Bridge Tech. Inc. v. Apple, Inc.*, No. 12-cv-04882-PSG, 2014 WL  
 16 1928977, at \*3 (N.D. Cal. May 14, 2014) (asking whether “the expert has permissibly specified  
 17 the application of a disclosed theory, or has ... impermissibly substituted a new theory  
 18 altogether”)). “The requirements of L.R. 3-8 could not be more clear: identify the theories of  
 19 recovery; identify the known facts that support the theories; do the math.” *Twilio, Inc. v.*  
 20 *Telesign Corp.*, No. 16-cv-06925-LHK (SVK), 2017 WL 5525929, at \*2 (N.D. Cal. Nov. 17,  
 21 2017). Plexxikon, meanwhile, has not supplemented its P.L.R. 3-8 damages contentions since  
 22 April 9, 2018, and has not at any time provided any theory for the recovery of damages post  
 23 December 2018, factual support for any such theory, or any computation of damages for such  
 24 period. Accordingly, Plexxikon should not be permitted to present such a theory to the jury.

25        Because Plexxikon’s expert concedes that [REDACTED]

26 [REDACTED] and Plexxikon never presented such

1 a theory during discovery, Plexxikon should not be permitted to offer evidence or opinion  
2 suggesting that the jury should award damages for any period after December 2018.

3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
WASHINGTON

1 Dated: August 27, 2019

Respectfully submitted,

2 /s/ Thomas P. Steindler

3 THOMAS P. STEINDLER (*Pro Hac Vice*)

4 tsteindler@mwe.com

5 PAUL SCHOENHARD (*Pro Hac Vice*)

6 pschoenhard@mwe.com

7 MICHAEL S. NADEL (*Pro Hac Vice*)

8 mnadel@mwe.com

9 IAN BROOKS (*Pro Hac Vice*)

10 ibrooks@mwe.com

11 JENNIFER ROUTH (*Pro Hac Vice*)

12 jrouth@mwe.com

13 DAVID MLAVER (*Pro Hac Vice*)

14 dmlaver@mwe.com

15 McDermott Will & Emery LLP

16 500 N. Capitol St., N.W.

17 Washington, DC 20001

18 Tel: (202) 756-8000

19 Fax: (202) 756-8087

20 WILLIAM G. GAEDE III (SBN: 136184)

21 wgaede@mwe.com

22 McDermott Will & Emery LLP

23 275 Middlefield Road, Suite 100

24 Menlo Park, CA 94025

25 Tel: (650) 815-7400

26 Fax: (650) 469-1470

27 KATHERINE NICOLE CLOUSE (*Pro Hac Vice*)

28 nclosure@mwe.com

29 McDermott Will & Emery LLP

30 28 State Street

31 Boston, MA 02109

32 Tel: (617) 535-4000

33 Fax: (617) 535-3800

34 *Attorneys for Defendant*

35 *Novartis Pharmaceuticals Corporation*

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

The undersigned attorney hereby certifies that on August 27, 2019, the foregoing was served on counsel for Plaintiff Plexxikon Inc. by electronic mail to at least the following addresses:

- SERVICE-BRAF@durietangri.com and
- Plexxikon@youngbasile.com

By: /s/ David Mlaver  
David Mlaver (*Pro Hac Vice*)

McDERMOTT WILL & EMERY LLP  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW